

**Questions / Comments from September 16<sup>th</sup> 2004 Public Meeting  
for Colorado Lagoon Restoration Feasibility Study**

Comments/Questions re Open Channel

- Comment: the open channel would cleanse the greatest and maximize habitat - this should be the prime thing – if have to eliminate other goodies to get open channel, then so be it. The open channel has the best water quality effect and habitat effect. Don't eliminate this.
- Comment: only makes sense to open up the channel – really boils down to this – this should be the top priority.
- Comment: have a problem with aesthetics of open channel, associated fencing, etc.
- Comment: “will bring my own shovel to dig out the channel”.
- Comment: mentioned bridges on roads over open channel.
- Comment re open channel going through park and disrupting sporting fields: formalizing the baseball field and soccer field areas would be a good thing.
- Comment: Sepulveda Basin / San Fernando Valley has done a great job of balancing open park with sports usage. Will get us a phone number of someone to contact there.

Comments/Questions re. Storm Drains

- If the storm drains are pulled out, and thus less fresh water gets to lagoon, will this be detrimental to the habitat?
- Are we doing anything about the number of storm drains entering the lagoon?
  - City discussed the Abtech-Smart-Sponges being inserted into the storm drain catch basins around the lagoon.
- How can we not be looking at doing something about the storm drains?
  - Should recommend that the City put in CDS and low flow diversion into phased implementation plan
    - City commented that the Boyle Engineering report said that storm drain diversion was not a good from a cost to benefit perspective, and that the County Sanitation District capacity is tapped out. The benefit does not outweigh the cost. Also there are significant maintenance costs. Noted that Termino Avenue Drain Project is doing diversion.
- Comment: we should divert as much as possible, then treat low flows and first flush with swales/ constructed wetlands.
- Comment: pleased with City's catch basin initiative.

Comments/Questions re Sediment Removal, Dredging

- Comment regarding the lagoon western arm: if we remove the sediment, don't let it come back from the Greenbelt. There is a significant erosion problem caused by construction along the Greenbelt. (Photos/slides were provided showing the problem). Construction area at 6<sup>th</sup> and Quincy is good example of how construction causing sediment problems, erosion through trucks driving on dirt roads. The builder has to replant the plants lost because of illegal use. But if these plants are bad, they may need to be removed.

- City comment: the Termino Avenue drain project will rip up this area anyway. The Parks and Rec. Dept needs to be included in the dialogue.
- Has the Port given us ideas on sediment removal, dredging constraints,
  - Will we have to do dewatering?
  - Will we have to close off the tidal gates when we do dredging?
  - We should make sure the Water Board is involved in this project
- Comment: dredging would be a significant impact to the habitat.
  - Bio-accumulation in the benthics doesn't happen for a long time
  - Important to minimize the impact of dredging on the habitat.
- When we bring up (remove) sediment, are we going to bring up contamination into the water?
- Are we going to dredge/drain the entire lagoon?
  - FOCL biologist said it takes three years to re-establish benthic organisms.
- Comment: U.S.F.W.S. and/or CDFG should be able to advise us on resources issue – i.e. affect of draining on habitat.
  - We should look at San Diego lagoon example
- Comment: agree that we need to keep healthy part (organisms) healthy and fix the bad part.
- Comment: would be bad to drain the whole lagoon.

#### Comments/Questions re How Alternatives Organized and Assessed

- Comment: we should put alternatives together as for a “jig-saw puzzle” – so that individual pieces can be selected for getting incremental funding.
- Comment: we need to prioritize the alternative components.
- Comment: don't like minimal/moderate/maximal approach
  - People will pick minimal. Instead look at them as individual pieces – phase and prioritize pieces – look at funding phasing. Look at the pieces all on a cost-benefit basis, then pick the ones that need to get done early. Do phased approach / master plan with phased components – phase 1, 2, etc. and go after sustainable.
- Are we doing our hydraulic modeling to the worst case conditions, regarding both tide and storm scenarios, including the proposed Termino Avenue drain into the lagoon? Make sure we are looking at max Q TADP alternative.
- Do we know how much each of these options cost?

#### Other Comments/Questions

- Are we planning to look at laying back slopes?
- Comment: there would be no impact to golfing if the fence was moved back.
- Comment: 7<sup>th</sup> tee golf screen concept will not work.
- Comment: the #1 priority should be cleaning up the health/safety hazards (e.g. the contaminated sediments), then opening the channel, then laying back the slopes.
- Comment: “dream” is to build a Wetlands Interpretive Center along the Greenbelt – the center would cover Colorado Lagoon, Dunster Preserve, and Marine Stadium wetlands areas.
- Comment: watershed BMPs are low tech and involve difficult culture change.
  - Consulting team said low-tech BMPs are the most effective. Mentioned Cal Trans development/assessment of BMPs. End of drain treatments are costly and

not as effective. Also, need large areas to collect and hold water for certain period; these areas are not available (except for at the golf course).

- Public comment: not impressed with the BMPs in the reports; would like to see these Cal Trans BMPs.
- Comment: without tidal flushing, will continue to have sediment input problem. (???)
- Comment: don't think that a perimeter trail is necessary- where habitat is sensitive, use platforms, telescopes, etc.
- Comment re kids model boat activity: the boats bump up on the shores where there is now iceplant and kids go there to retrieve their boats. Thus, we need to make sure we don't cause any safety problems in this area if we make changes there.
- Comment: would like to see open channel culvert and sediment removal as minimum.
- Comment: the City wants to hear what the citizens want.
- Comment: no sense in planting, etc., if we can't sustain water quality.
- Comment re sandy intertidal on north shore: if we do this for Least Tern and Snowy Plover nesting, then the only way to establish this is to eliminate the American Crows who are predators. Will it be okay for people to bring out their shotguns to rid the crows?
- Comment: yes, feral ducks need to be managed, but it is their home too.
- Have we considered permeable pavement for road and parking lot?
- Comment: anything done should be "green certifiable".
- Comment: need to approach golfers in advance.
- Comment: this person had been working on the Naples seawall project for seven years and has had a lot of trouble getting money for this. We should not expect that we can get a lot of money to do what we want. Advised that we really should do what will clean up the lagoon fastest with the least amount of money.

Also, at the meeting, Ray Thorn provided a one-page set of written comments titled "Feasibility Study of Colorado Lagoon – Tasks 1-8, Friends of Colorado Lagoon Assessments and Recommendations".